
CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC.

AFFILIATED

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF DAY NURSERIES, INC.

130 EAST TWENTY-SECOND ST., NEW YORK, N. Y.

VOL. XV, No. 4

OCT 28 1936

BULLETIN

APRIL, 1936

*"But the young, young children, O my brothers,
They are weeping in the playtime of the others
In the country of the free!"*

—ELIZABETH BARRETT BROWNING

New Cities Join League's Campaign

NEW YORK is the twenty-second city to participate in the League's nation-wide individual membership campaign. Among the most recent ones taking up the program are Boston, Memphis and Dayton. Due to the recent disastrous floods, campaigns have been postponed in Pittsburgh and Hartford.

The New York campaign opened March 31 with a meeting in the Russell Sage Foundation Building, attended by representatives of 17 child-caring organizations, including both member and non-member agencies. Speakers were William Hodson, New York City commissioner of public welfare, David C. Adie, New York State commissioner of social welfare, and George O. Tamblin, who is advising the League in its membership program. C. W. Areson, assistant executive director of the League, presided.

The League's program for obtaining \$100,000 in

memberships and contributions toward its budgets for 1936 and 1937 was outlined by Mr. Areson. He told of progress to date, stating that there were chairmen or committees at work in practically all the large eastern and mid-western cities.

Mr. Hodson summarized the League's purposes, and, after reviewing its accomplishments, stressed the critical need for a national agency to promote better care for dependent children, urging the local child-caring agencies to cooperate in making the League's New York campaign a success.

The need for a non-governmental agency capable of mobilizing support for legislation beneficial to children, and of opposing that which is not, was stressed by Mr. Adie. He urged all interested in child welfare to help increase the League's influence and effectiveness.

(Continued on page 7)

Inter-Agency Relationships in Child Protection

HELEN W. HANCHETTE AND MARJORIE BOGGS

(This article by Miss Hanchette, general secretary, and Miss Boggs, case consultant, The Associated Charities, Institute of Family Service, Cleveland, continues a discussion of protective work from the March issue of the BULLETIN.)

ANY child's problem is or has been a family problem. Any family problem creates a problem for the child in that family. There is, therefore, greater confusion between the family and the children's fields than in any others, and the worker in either field finds himself working with both children and adults, often with identical procedure.

Certain specialized services—child placement in the children's field, and family maintenance relief in the family field—clarify the issue when the need falls definitely in line with the existing service, but

where the need is not clearly defined, the service may be essentially the same whether the client asks for help in placing a child or for financial assistance.

IN our mutual efforts to improve working relationships, we frequently find special confusion as to responsibility in the so-called "protective cases." In the broader sense of mental abuse or neglect, much of the work of a family agency could be classified as protection of children. Domestic incompatibility between parents, or marked maladjustment of one or both parents, must entail some suffering to the child.

We hear family workers with too fixed habits of

(Continued on page 6)

Atlantic City—May 24-30

AS Miss Sophie van S. Theis, chairman of the League's Conference Committee, left on April 2 for an extended trip abroad, Miss Helen D. Cole, director of the foster home department of the New York Children's Aid Society, is serving as chairman. The preliminary program for the League's meetings in Atlantic City is as follows. The final listing will appear in the regular program of the National Conference of Social Work.

MONDAY, MAY 25

3:00-4:30 P.M.

Presiding: Miss Ruth Taylor, Commissioner of Public Welfare, Westchester County, Valhalla, New York.

1. The Security Act and Child Welfare—Miss Mary Irene Atkinson, Director, Child Welfare Division, Children's Bureau, Washington, D. C.
2. New Partnerships Between Public and Private Child Welfare Organizations—Arthur Dunham, Professor of Community Organization, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

TUESDAY, MAY 26

3:00-4:30 P.M.

Presiding: Alfred F. Whitman, Executive Secretary, Children's Aid Association, Boston.

- Is Psychological Treatment the Answer to the Unplaceable Child?—Miss Irene Liggett, Assistant Secretary, Children's Aid Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Discussants: To be announced.

6:45 P.M. Dinner. Campaign Report.

Attendance limited to: Members of League's Board of Directors; executives of League's member agencies, and one other delegate from each member agency, preferably with official appointment; and members of the League's National Committee on Child Welfare. (Tickets for this dinner will be sold only at the League's consultation booth, Convention Hall, Atlantic City. This private dinner meeting is sometimes confused with the annual meeting of the League, which is open to the public, reservations for which are made at the regular Conference ticket booth, not at that of the League.)

Presiding: Jacob Kepecs, President, Child Welfare League of America.

Speaker: To be announced.

Discussion.

WEDNESDAY, MAY 27

1:00 P.M. Luncheon

Presiding: Jacob Kepecs, President, Child Welfare League of America, and Superintendent, Jewish Home Finding Society of Chicago.

Speaker: To be announced.

THURSDAY, MAY 28

3:00-4:30 P.M. (Joint Session with National Federation of Day Nurseries.)

Presiding: Dr. Ruth Brickner, Psychiatrist, Child Study Association, New York.

The Needs of Infants and Pre-School Children of Dependent Families:

1. From the Point of View of the Social Worker—Miss Anita Waldhorst Lockwood, Director, Foster Home Department, Brooklyn Nursery and Infants' Hospital, Brooklyn, New York.
2. From the Point of View of the Educator—Dr. Lois Hayden Meek, Director, Child Development Institute, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York.
3. From the Point of View of the Pediatrician—Speaker: To be announced.

7:00 P.M. Dinner. Annual Meeting.

Presiding: Jacob Kepecs, President, Child Welfare League of America.

1. President's Address—Jacob Kepecs.
2. Executive Director's Report—C. C. Carstens.

FRIDAY, MAY 29

3:00-4:30 P.M. Series of Group Discussions.

1. County Organization for Child Care.

Leader: Miss Florence L. Sullivan, Consultant in Child Welfare, Children's Bureau, Washington, D. C.

2. Interviews with Prospective Foster Parents.

Leader: Miss Dorothy Hutchinson, Faculty of New York School of Social Work.

3. The Institution and an Evaluation of Its Experiments in Providing Formal Education for Its Children.

Leader: Dr. Thomas W. Brockbank, Director, Guidance Institute, The Catholic Guardian Society, New York.

4. Day Nurseries.

Leader: Miss Amy Hostler, Executive Secretary, National Federation of Day Nurseries, New York.

5. Relationship Between Children's Agencies and Family Agencies in Protective Work for Children.

Leader: Miss E. Marguerite Gane, Executive Secretary, Children's Aid and S.P.C.C., Buffalo, New York.

6. Evaluation of Child Caring Organization Experiences in Providing Care and Training for Boys and Girls over Sixteen.

Leader: Louis E. Evans, Division Director, Children's and Minor's Service Division, Illinois Emergency Relief Commission, Chicago.

7. Volunteers in Child Welfare.

Leader: Miss Evelyn Davis, National Volunteers Association, New York.

8. Worker's Relationship to Foster Parents.

Leader: Miss Margaret Gray, Supervisor of Boarding Homes, Department of Child Welfare of Westchester County, White Plains, New York.

9. Experiments in Staff Training.

Leader: Harrison Dobbs, Professor of Case Work, General Supervisor of Field Work, School of Social Service, University of Chicago.

10. The Maternity Home as a Social Agency.

Leader: Miss Grace A. Reeder, Secretary, Dependent Children Section, Welfare Council, New York.

The Child Welfare League of America and the National Federation of Day Nurseries will jointly conduct a booth at the National Conference consultation center in Convention Hall. Appointments

(Continued on page 8)

Day School Nurseries in Los Angeles

FLORA D. SMITH

(Miss Smith is in charge of day school nurseries, Los Angeles City School District.)

THE Los Angeles Board of Education has maintained day nurseries since 1910. At the present time there are 20 nurseries, with a staff of 20 senior matrons and 35 junior matrons. At one time there were 27 day nurseries in the Los Angeles School Department.

In 1908, a representative from the Parent Teacher Association visited Utah Street Elementary School to talk on the value of home economics courses. She found babies in improvised cradles and in baby buggies in the principal's office and in some of the classrooms. The socially-minded principal, Miss Alice Cushing, when investigating the causes of absences, discovered that many pupils were detained at home to care for the younger children in the family because the mother was gainfully employed. Miss Cushing suggested that the older pupils bring their pre-school brothers and sisters to school with them. The influx of babies in response to her suggestion was unexpected, and for a time, overwhelming.

RECOGNIZING the urgent need of a day nursery in the Utah Street School District, the Tenth District Parent Teacher Association conferred immediately with the superintendent of schools regarding the establishment of a nursery to be sponsored by their organization. Interested merchants made substantial contributions of bedding and other necessary equipment. A three-room cottage near the school was rented, and a competent matron was employed and paid by the Parent Teacher Association. Bazaars and cookery sales were held to raise money to help defray the expenses of the nursery.

As a part of their home economics course, 7th and 8th grade girls in the school were given instruction in the care of babies in the nursery. Since the transfer of the 7th and 8th grades to junior high schools, this program has not been continued.

The nursery experiment was so successful that in November, 1910, the Board of Education formally authorized the day nursery as an integral part of the school program. This decision was influenced by statistics which showed a loss to the school department approximating the cost of maintaining the nursery:

a. Loss of average daily attendance, caused by the absence of older children who remained at home to care for younger children. (Allocation of school funds is based on average daily attendance.)

b. Additional cost of education of pupils repeating grades because of irregular attendance.

The fee in school nurseries is 10 cents per day, which covers the cost of lunches and milk. All other expenses—salaries, laundry, lighting, heating, equipment, and general supplies—are paid by the Board of Education.

During 1934-35, there were 2,979 children enrolled in the day school nurseries, 2,361 of whom were pre-school children and 618 were kindergarten children. Kindergarten children attend the nurseries afternoons or mornings according to their enrollment in the A. M. or P. M. session of the kindergarten.

Day school nurseries may not be organized without a permit from the City Health Department, and are inspected by the City Health Department to ascertain if they are conducted in accordance with the State, county, and city sanitary laws. The cooperation of the City Health Department has proved to be very constructive.

Mothers enrolled in adult day classes may leave their babies in the day nurseries while they are attending school. If there are extenuating circumstances in the homes which make temporary care of the children in the nursery socially expedient and advisable, exceptions to general rules of enrolling pre-school children are made.

THE hours vary in different nurseries. Since by far the greater number of nursery children are brought by and called for by older brothers and sisters attend-

(Continued on page 7)

\$100,000

IN order to maintain and increase its services the Child Welfare League of America is seeking \$100,000 through individual memberships of three types: *Donors*, \$100 and over; *Sustaining*, \$50 to \$99; and *Contributing*, \$5 to \$49. Checks are payable to J. G. Harbord, Treasurer, Child Welfare League of America, Inc., 130 E. 22nd St., New York, N. Y.

BULLETIN

Published monthly (omitted in July and August) as the official organ of the Child Welfare League of America and the National Federation of Day Nurseries.

C. C. CARSTENS, Editor
FLORENCE M. PHARO, Assistant Editor

The Bulletin is in large measure a Forum for discussion in print of child welfare problems. Endorsement does not necessarily go with the printing of opinions expressed over a signature.

Annual subscription, \$1.00 Single copies, 10c.
Checks payable to Child Welfare League of America, Inc.

Safeguards in Adoption

WHEN a family comes to the conclusion that it wishes to adopt a child, its members often want to bring the child from far away, where they are unknown, and where in great secrecy they may at once complete the legal proceedings.

Naturally, adoptions should be undertaken without publicity and blare of trumpets. But why such secrecy and haste? Both family and child need protection from hazards liable to be connected with the complicated readjustment of human lives involved in the social procedures of an adoption.

The family should be safeguarded against receiving with high hopes a child who in the long years ahead will prove to be a disappointment to them. The child should be safeguarded, for instance, against becoming an artificial anchorage for an unsuccessful marriage, or against becoming the victim of a woman's desire for a baby that might be to her a plaything—when she should have acquired instead a poodle dog.

Only a reasonable margin of time reveals the motives that lie back of some adoptions. For this reason various states have required that from six months to a year shall elapse before the adoption can be legally completed.

The family unable to wait that long must be protected against the haste that will sometimes bring much greater heartache at a later time. The child has the right to be protected by society against becoming a victim of someone's importunity.

Let the family demand the facts regarding the child's heredity and physical and mental condition, and beware of the agency that cannot or will not give them. Let the court protect the child against the risks that the waiving of legal safeguards may have in store for all concerned.

—C. C. CARSTENS

Children's Agencies Aid Flood Relief

TELEGRAMS and letters from League member agencies in some of the recently flooded cities and towns tell of quick action by the agencies, chiefly in cooperation with the American Red Cross.

PENNSYLVANIA. In Pittsburgh, the Children's Aid Society and the Children's Service Bureau loaned workers to the Red Cross, the more mature being attached to area offices as child welfare consultants. One worker was detailed to broadcasting at frequent intervals a request for all families caring for refugee children without their parents to communicate with Red Cross headquarters. In addition, contact was made with every shelter for further information about children separated from their parents.

At Lewistown, the branch office of the Children's Aid Society of Pennsylvania provided temporary foster home care for 14 children, homeless on account of the flood. One foster boarding home was washed away completely. Williamsport headquarters were set up in the house of the county secretary. Temporarily, 35 foster homes were affected. In Wilkes-Barre, six foster homes were abandoned for the time being. Three staff workers were loaned for flood relief work. One child in Bedford was homeless on account of the flood, and the county secretary herself was temporarily without a home.

CONNECTICUT. Word by telegraph from Hartford was reassuring. Child welfare workers were assisting in relief for about 6,000 under the care of the Red Cross in schools and public buildings.

NEW HAMPSHIRE. The staff of the New Hampshire Children's Aid and Protective Society was placed at the call of the Red Cross. Children living at Coit House, Concord, worked voluntarily with the staff, preparing Red Cross contributions, and helping 10 child refugees who were guests at Coit House, sharing personal belongings with them. The families stricken by the flood were being housed in the armory and elsewhere, but the children had been placed in private homes when possible.

MASSACHUSETTS. The Massachusetts S.P.C.C. assigned workers in various towns to assist in the relief work. The Children's Aid Association, Northampton, sheltered some mothers with babies in its institution, and was cooperating with the Red Cross in plans for rehabilitation. In Springfield, the Children's Aid Association, which had two of its foster family homes in flooded sections, also volunteered its services.

MAINE. The branch office of the New England Home for Little Wanderers, Waterville, reported that the Red Cross, with the assistance of the various agencies, was giving shelter to 10,000 homeless in Maine. A two-year-old child was drowned in a flooded cellar.

NEW YORK. The Southern Tier Children's Home, Elmira, made a point of getting out supplies of cod liver oil to all children in foster home care as a preventive measure in case of epidemics. Electric heating was installed in homes with flooded cellars.

OHIO. Appeals from Ohio River towns for children's clothing were met by the Division of Charities of the Ohio Department of Public Welfare.

Definitions—Protective and Foster Care

(One of the obstacles in gathering reliable information about the number of children under the care or supervision of organizations is that of terminology. This was brought out in answers to a recent questionnaire sent by the Child Welfare League of America to its member agencies, regarding the numbers of children "under protective care" and "under foster care" on January 1, 1936. Comments on the following discussion will be welcome.)

ANY child who has been accepted by an organization for supervision without *separation* from his own family is under "protective care." Any child who has been *separated* from his own family is in "foster care"—whether the child is in the home of relatives, in the receiving home of the organization, in a foster-care institution, in a foster family home, or elsewhere.

Children should not be regarded as in either protective care or foster care until the cases are actually accepted. Cases in the application or investigation stage, and pending cases of minor service, should not appear in the total reported number of children in care or under supervision.

In order to test the classification of cases actually accepted by an organization, the following fictitious instances are presented for consideration and discussion:

1. HOUSEKEEPER SERVICE. Mrs. Brown is ill, and the agency has supplied a housekeeper to look after the home and the six children. (*Protective care.*)

2. RECEIVING HOME. Johnny has been taken into the home of the agency, pending placement in an institution or foster family home. (*Foster care.*)

3. RECEIVING HOME. Mary is in the receiving home of an agency, pending decision as to whether she can be safely returned to her family. (*Foster care.*)

4. LIVING WITH RELATIVE. Ruth, an adolescent,

cannot get along with her stepmother, and she has gone to live with a maternal aunt. The aunt wants to keep Ruth with her, but cannot afford to do so. The agency, which has assumed no responsibility in finding this home for Ruth, but approves it, agrees to supply maintenance for Ruth as her own family cannot arrange to do so. (*Foster care.*)

5. LIVING WITH RELATIVE. Bobby, after his mother died, was apparently without a friend in the world. However, the children's agency discovered that an uncle was living in a nearby town. The uncle and his wife agreed to take Bobby but they were not sure whether "it would work out." The agency placed the boy in this home, believing that it was a good one for him and might prove permanent. (*Foster care.*)

6. IN A HOSPITAL. Rachel had had infantile paralysis, and the children's agency made arrangements for her treatment in a hospital. (*Protective care*—as she had not been *separated* from her family but was merely being provided with hospital care.)

7. IN NURSES' TRAINING SCHOOL. Nancy, an orphan and a ward of the children's agency, is in training to be a nurse. (*Foster care*—as the agency is still the guardian to whom Nancy can turn until she is of age.)

8. UNMARRIED MOTHER AND BABY. Regina, age 17, and her baby are living with a friend. Regina is working and paying nominal board for herself and the child. The baby is cared for by the friend during the mother's absence. The children's agency has arranged licensing of this boarding home, and continues supervision. (*Foster care.*)

9. DAY NURSERY CARE. The children's agency has arranged for Rosie and Tony to attend a day nursery while their mother is working. It was found that the mother had been leaving the children with a good-natured but gin-drinking neighbor who left the children to their own devices during the long hours of the day. (*Protective care*—as the agency did not *separate* the children from their own home.)

10. DELINQUENT BOY. Edward, a youthful gangster who roamed the country footloose, was placed by a children's agency in a series of family homes before one was found that could manage him. Mr. and Mrs. Adams seemed to understand him, and he slowly responded to this new home. Finally it was felt, however, that Edward would benefit from group life in an institution, and arrangements were made for him to go to a farm school conducted by another agency. (*Foster care*—in the family home, and also in the institution.)

Inter-Agency Relationships in Child Protection

(Continued from page 1)

thinking criticize children's workers because their eager interest in safeguarding the child precludes their seeing the parent and his need; we also hear children's workers accuse family workers of letting the child suffer unduly, while concentrating on long-drawn-out treatment with the parent. There may be justification in both these criticisms. They indicate the need for more sharing of our thinking, and greater flexibility in our procedures.

Mrs. Smith, obviously distraught, comes to a family agency in fear of losing a good job because she has no one with whom to leave her two-year-old child. Her husband drinks, abuses her, and would be sure to harm the child. Her own mother, annoyed at Mr. Smith, refuses to keep the child longer.

The family case worker might take Mrs. Smith's request at face value and try to get the father to see things differently, to persuade the mother to keep the child regardless, to convince Mrs. Smith to accept financial aid and stay at home, or to refer to a child-placing agency. Mrs. Smith probably would have offered objections to each suggestion, and gone away unhappy and distressed. But, recognizing the need of every human being to give rational explanations for irrational desires, the case worker encourages Mrs. Smith to tell more so that together they may find a solution.

The genuineness of the case worker's desire to understand and to be of help relieves Mrs. Smith's anxiety so she can express her real feelings. She had never wanted the child, had come to hate her husband even before it was born. "But, of course, I love her now," she says. "It is because I love her that I must find placement so my husband won't kill her." Then she adds, "It's funny, as much as he hates the baby, she likes to sit on his lap and is quiet, but when I hold her she is always jumpy and sometimes falls off."

When asked if she would like her mother to continue to keep the child, she blurts out, "I can't stand her having my baby. Sometimes I think my mother hates me. She doesn't believe my husband treats me badly. She says I've made my own bed and can lie on it—that I don't love my baby, and shouldn't have had her."

The case worker realizes now that the problem lies within Mrs. Smith. She does not want her child, but has to keep hidden from herself her desire to

harm it. The case worker is now in position to help Mrs. Smith see her own mixed-up feelings as a part of her unhappiness, and to explain how the agency can help her through controlled interviews to relieve some of her inner pressures and understand her own feelings so that she can live more comfortably with them.

Mrs. Smith might have gone first to a children's agency for placement, giving the same surface picture of her difficulties. The worker there might have used the same interviewing process, and offered the same kind of case work help; or, on the other hand, might have tried either to carry through the requested placement or have referred to a family agency for financial assistance, in either of which procedures she would have failed to get Mrs. Smith's real feelings or desires.

SEEING Mrs. Smith as a distressed person coming to an agency in either field, we are faced with two major considerations important in our joint thinking today.

First, the responsibility of the initial case worker to offer the opportunity of an unhurried hearing in which the client actually experiences being understood, with a clear explanation of what help she may expect through case work.

This means that agencies must place their most highly skilled workers at the point of intake, workers who feel sufficiently free to lose agency affiliations in the process of trying to understand, as case workers, what is really troubling the person who has come to them for help.

If the initial interviewer carries on to where the client feels that she has been helped, an explanation of case work will make it possible for her to go to another agency.

Second, the need for greater flexibility and freedom in inter-agency working relationships.

Suppose Mrs. Smith does return to the family case worker. As the treatment relationship develops, the fear of her harming the child may at some point become so intensified that temporary placement is indicated. A treatment relationship cannot be lightly passed from one worker to another. Should not the case worker feel free here to tap this resource without a break in the treatment relationship?

Or, suppose Mrs. Smith wants to and does return to the children's agency case worker, and later loses her job, or is impelled by emerging conflicts to give it up. Should not financial service be available without disrupting the existing relationship with the children's agency?

Such flexibility in utilizing resources of different agencies for the greatest gain to the client, would call for a fine quality of continuous study and evaluation carried on jointly by the agencies concerned. But skills can be developed only through uninterrupted trial in practice and through careful evaluation of results.

PROBABLY we shall always need broad lines of demarcation in terms of function. But if we have really passed beyond the era when we knew what was good for the client, and tried to "gain his cooperation" when we "gave" him the right to make decisions; if we have really accepted the concept that the individual is self-determining, that we can stimulate him to help himself but cannot force help on him; if we recognize that the right to determine is his inalienable right, one we can't "give" him and never had the right to give, then we are ready as case workers rather than as agency workers, ready to do joint experimenting in the interest of case work development even when such experimentation may mean occasional waiving of agency regulations otherwise necessary and desirable.

Day School Nurseries in Los Angeles

(Continued from page 3)

ing school, it is unnecessary to keep the nurseries open as late as six o'clock. This is a hardship for the mothers who leave their babies in the school nurseries and do not have other children attending school. The closing of school nurseries on Saturdays, school holidays, and during July and August works another hardship on these mothers.

Conferences are difficult to arrange in school nurseries for the mothers who do not leave or call for their children. Evening meetings, and special appointments with these parents on days when they are not employed, have helped to work out satisfactory solutions of problems regarding schedules of feeding, sleeping, *et cetera*, for their children.

The Los Angeles city day school nursery program is conducted in accordance with accepted standards of day nurseries. As much of the nursery school procedure is incorporated in the day school nurseries as is consistent with the limitations imposed by a curtailed budget and an inadequate number of employees on the staff.

During the years of depression when school budgets have been cut drastically, it has been very

heartening that the school nurseries were not discontinued, thus providing educational opportunities for many older children who otherwise would have been denied these opportunities. Also, their continuance has assisted mothers who were obliged to supplement their meager family incomes.

New Cities Join League's Campaign

(Continued from page 1)

Mr. Tamblyn outlined the proposed plan of campaign. He recommended as the next step that each of those present enroll five others as members of the New York committee, and bring them to the next meeting. This was agreed upon.

Mrs. Margaret N. Shriver, director of the New York Child's Foster Home Service, reported that the board of directors of her agency had voted to treble the contribution it made to the League last year.

The organizations represented at the meeting were:

- Brooklyn Children's Aid Society
- Brooklyn Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Children
- Children's Aid Society of New York
- Federation of Protestant Welfare Agencies
- Fellowship House
- Hebrew Orphan Asylum
- Hebrew Sheltering Guardian Society
- Hopewell Society of Brooklyn
- Jewish Board of Guardians
- Leake and Watts Orphan House
- New York Child's Foster Home Service
- Orphan Asylum Society
- Sheltering Arms
- Society for Relief of Destitute Children of Seamen
- Society for the Relief of Half-Orphan and Destitute Children
- Speedwell Society
- State Charities Aid Association

OUR preliminary meeting in Boston on March 25 was attended by representatives of eight organizations:

- Boston Children's Friend Society
- Children's Aid Society
- Children's Mission to Children
- Church Home Society
- Jewish Child Welfare Association
- Massachusetts Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Children
- New England Home for Little Wanderers
- State Department of Public Welfare, Division of Child Guardianship

Alfred F. Whitman, executive secretary of the Children's Aid Society, presided, bringing before the

meeting the purpose of the campaign. Mr. Areson explained its objectives in detail. Theodore A. Lothrop, executive secretary of the Massachusetts Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Children, discussed relations with the United States Children's Bureau, and the relation of League support to the budgeted funds from the Boston Community Federation.

Otto Bradley, the Federation's director, dealt with this feature of the financial situation, and indicated that, of course, those agencies that had already included the League in their budgeted requests to the Federation would continue to do so. He further indicated that in his belief the League would not be excluded from other budgets in which it had not been given a place in previous years.

Mr. Whitman, Cheney C. Jones, superintendent of the New England Home for Little Wanderers, and Ralph Barrow, executive director of the Church Home Society, were appointed to serve as a steering committee authorized to secure a chairman, chairmen of sub-committees for memberships and lists, arrange for a public meeting, and set up a publicity committee. As rapidly as possible, the steering committee's duties will be transferred to lay committees from the several boards of directors.

In Dayton, C. C. Carstens, executive director of the League, met with the board of directors of the Children's Bureau with regard to plans for a campaign in Dayton; and in Memphis, Miss Sybil Foster, field secretary of the League, met with representatives of the agencies. In Louisville, the following are serving as members of the League's campaign committee: Charles W. Allen, Mrs. Henry Heyburn, Mrs. John Walker Moore, Mrs. Ex. Norton, and Mrs. Charles G. Tachau.

Byron T. Hacker, executive director, Children's Community Center, New Haven, announces that Mrs. Harold Burr has consented to serve as chairman of the New Haven committee. Mrs. Burr is a member of the board of directors of the Children's Community Center. She will be assisted by three other members of the board, and by three board members of the Connecticut Child Welfare Association.

The first year of the establishment of individual membership in the League will be completed at the time of the annual meeting in May. On that occasion, the League wishes to demonstrate how impressive is the number of its supporters, and how wide their distribution, by indicating the extent of enrolment in each city. To give the League the influence and effectiveness it requires, wide distribu-

tion of membership is hardly less essential than numbers. Member agencies and others in the West and South are being urged to gain for their communities as large a representation as possible.

Social Work to Pass in Review

CHARACTERIZING the 63d annual meeting of the National Conference of Social Work in Atlantic City the week of May 24 to 30 as one of the most important events in Conference history, Monsignor Robert F. Keegan, the president, says:

"The fact that planned welfare work in America is touching a high point in achievement, that social security has been pulled from the hazy lofts of ideology into the prospects of reality, that current practice is erasing haphazard trial and error, emphasizes this point. Much has been done—a great deal remains to be accomplished."

Atlantic City—May 24-30

(Continued from page 2)

will be made at the booth for consultations with board and staff members. As announced in previous issues of the BULLETIN, headquarters hotel of the League will be at the Ritz-Carlton. That of the National Federation of Day Nurseries is Hotel President. Hotel reservations should be made with Albert H. Skean, Director of Hotels and Houses, Convention Bureau, 16 Central Pier, Atlantic City, New Jersey. As a record attendance is expected, early reservation is important.

Enclosures

(Sent to League Member Agencies Only)

TOWARD A NEW YORK CHILDREN'S CHARTER, by Mary E. Boretz, Executive Director, Home Bureau, Hebrew Sheltering Guardian Society, 139 W. 126th St., New York, N. Y. Article telling of steps taken to review child-care program in New York City in the light of community needs, reprinted from *Better Times*, March 2, 1936, issue, periodical of the Welfare Council of New York City, 122 E. 22nd St., New York, N. Y. Reprints supplied through courtesy of Miss Boretz. (Single copy of periodical, 35 cents.)

SOME CURRENT BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS FOR THE CASE WORKER. Mimeographed reading list issued by Family Welfare Association of America, 130 E. 22nd St., New York, N. Y. Copies available upon request.

FIFTH ANNUAL REPORT, The Children's Agency, 215 E. Walnut St., Louisville, Ky. Small printed folder of statistics.

Celebration suggestions for May Day—Child Health Day, 1936, may be secured from Children's Bureau, U. S. Department of Labor, Washington, D. C.